

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

VIMALA, LLC, et al.,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	NO. 3:19-cv-00513
)	JUDGE RICHARDSON
WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

The Court has received from the Special Master three different documents that collectively constitute his substantive reply in support of his motion at Docket Entry 208. Specifically, the Court has received from him a “Reply,” the “Special Master’s report in re [this case]” (the Report”) and a April 30, 2023 billing statement to the parties in this case. The Court has also received (a) an alternate version of page 10 of the Report that adds the date of May 1, 2023 and the Special Master’s signature; and (b) a CV for the Special Master. The Court will separately file the Special Master’s Reply, and will separately attach thereto each of the other four documents, namely:

1. The Report
2. April 30, 2023 billing statement
3. The signed and date version of page 10 of the Report
4. The Special Master’s CV

In the Report, the Special Master has made detailed findings (regarding the matters he was appointed by the Court to address) that are derogatory to certain individuals and entities who, in light of the dismissal of Plaintiffs’ action several months ago, have not had an opportunity to

specifically contest those findings. For this reason, the interests in favor of sealing the Report (namely, the need to protect the aforementioned individuals and entities from findings they have not had an opportunity to challenge) outweigh the interests of the public accessing them, especially since the Report was filed in support of what is ultimately a payment dispute between parties that is collateral to this lawsuit. So the Report (meaning only item no. 1 listed above) will be filed by the Court under seal. Likewise, the Reply contains allegations that are derogatory to certain individuals and entities who have not had an opportunity to specifically contest those particular allegations. For this reason, the interests in favor of sealing the Reply (namely, the need to protect the aforementioned individuals and entities from allegations they have not had an opportunity to challenge) outweigh the interests of the public accessing the Reply, given that it was filed in support of what is ultimately a payment dispute between parties that is collateral to this lawsuit.

Nothing in the above paragraph is meant to convey either that the Court does or will, or does not or will not, ultimately agree with the Special Master's findings or allegations. Nor is anything in the above paragraph meant to convey that the Court has or will, or has not or will not, conclude that such findings are ultimately material (in whole or in part) to the Court's resolution of the Motion. And nothing in the above paragraph is meant to convey that the Report or the Reply could never be unsealed in whole or in part at some point.

Accordingly, the Report and Reply shall be filed separately by the Court under seal.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


ELI RICHARDSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE